

- REMARKS / ARGUMENTS -**Summary of the Examiner's office action**

The claim rejections indicated in the Examiner's action are as follows:

Claims	§112(1)	§112(2)	§103(a)	Status/References
1, 3-12	X			Fail to comply with written description requirement.
1, 3-12		X		Indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject-matter which Applicant regards as invention.
1, 3, 5-7, 9-12			X	Unpatentable over Tsukamoto et al. (US 6,570,569) in view of Ito (US 6,690,810)

Amendments

Claims 1 and 3 to 10 were canceled, re-written as claims 13 to 24 and reordered for clarity. The following table describes the amendments carried out.

No.	Supported by	Amendments
13	Amended Claim 1 Paragraphs 41 to 44, 45	The definition of the graphics image data file was amended to read "on which is graphically defined a plurality of explosion parameters of said video particle explosion effect, one of said explosion parameters being a shape of a plurality of particles"
14	First portion of Claim 4	
15	Original Claim 2	
16	Amended Claim 1 Paragraphs 41 to 44	The channels and parameters were clearly linked so that "each channel of said plurality of channels defines one corresponding parameter of the plurality

Serial No. 09/828,457
Reply to Office Action of February 6, 2006

Agent's Ref. 10442-17US
Amtd. dated April 24, 2006

		of explosion parameters and the plurality of channels define a corresponding plurality of explosion parameters"
17	Claim 3	
18	Last portion of Claim 4	
19	Claim 5	
20	Claim 6	
21	Claim 7	
22	Claims 7-8	Claims 7 and 8 were combined to more clearly express claim 22.
23	Claim 9	
24	Claim 10	The dependency was changed.

Claims 11 and 12 were amended as shown in marked-up.

Arguments

The irregularities identified by the Examiner with respect to indefinite subject matter and written description requirements were corrected in the present amendment. Amendments to claims 1 (now claim 13) and 11 clarify what Applicant views as the invention and render all claims fully defined.

The Amendments carried out also clarify what distinguishes Applicant's invention from Tsukamoto et al. and Ito since these prior art references, even when combined, do not teach or suggest to graphically define a plurality of explosion parameters of a video particle explosion effect in a graphics image data file.

Serial No. 09/828,457
Reply to Office Action of February 6, 2006

Agent's Ref. 10442-17US
Amdt. dated April 24, 2006

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the rejections and objections of claims 1 and 3 to 12 is respectfully requested. It is believed that claims 10 to 24 are allowable over the prior art, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
David Bordeleau et al.

By:

Isabelle Chabot

Isabelle CHABOT,
Registration No. 55,764
Patent agent
Tel. No. 418-640-5174

Customer Number 020988
OGILVY RENAULT, LLP

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the
Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Isabelle CHABOT (Reg. No. 55,764)
Name of person signing certification

Isabelle Chabot

Signature

April 24, 2006

Date

Serial No. 09/828,457
Reply to Office Action of February 6, 2006

Agent's Ref. 10442-17US
Amdt. dated April 24, 2006

- 7 -